

# **Relay Services Center Data Request Instructions**

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **For TRS, STS, IP and VRS**

#### **SECTION B Annual Recurring Variable Expenses**

##### **1. Salaries and Benefits**

A Provide a detailed schedule of the number of employees – management and non-management, and the components of their compensation, including salaries and benefits. The schedule should tie to the actual and projected demand for 2002 - 2005

B Provide a detailed schedule of the occupancy and utilization percentages used to develop the number of employees required to meet call volumes. The schedule should tie to the schedule requested in A above.

#### **SECTION C Annual Administrative Expenses**

##### **2. Engineering**

Provide a detailed schedule of engineering costs, separating Research and Development from general engineering, for 2002 – 2005.

##### **9. Other Corporate Overheads**

Provide a detailed schedule of the marketing and advertising expenses included on this line for 2002 – 2005

#### **SECTION D Annual Depreciation/Amortization Associated with Capital Investment**

##### **2. Telecommunications Equipment**

Provide the type of depreciation used

##### **4. Other Capitalized**

Explain the depreciation expense noted on this line

#### **SECTION E Other TRS Expenses**

##### **1. Taxes**

Provide a detailed schedule of the tax expenses included on this line for 2002 - 2005.

##### **2. Other**

What percentage profit margin was used?

Provide a detailed explanation of the application of the profit margin to the costs to arrive at the total profit included for 2002 - 2005

##### **3. Outreach**

Provide a detailed schedule of the outreach expenses included on this line for 2002 – 2005.

#### **SECTION F Interstate Only Expenses**

##### **2. Outreach/Advertising**

Provide a detailed schedule separating outreach and advertising expenses included on this line for 2002 – 2005

**Center Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Relay Services Center Data Request

**Please read the attached instructions carefully before completing the data request.**

## I. Provider/Center Identification

### A. Service Provider/Administrator

Provider: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Contact Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email ID: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
 City/State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Telephone \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

### B. Center Location

Contact Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Email ID: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
City/State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

### C. Data Request Response

Contact Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Email ID: \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

**D. To assist NECA in data analysis,** please summarize any service changes/activities/improvements since the 2003 filing, or planned for 2004/2005, that caused/may cause substantial changes in cost and/or demand data. Examples: addition of a state; loss of a state contract; increase in volumes due to specific outreach program; call volume decrease due to use of internet or other non-TRS technology; decrease in minutes due to new, time saving technology, changes in volumes due to abnormal weather conditions; etc. Include any characteristics unique to a center (center may be in a high/low cost area; partial volunteer or part time staffing) or changes in the relay services marketplace as a whole.

[illegible]

Center Name: \_\_\_\_\_

### Relay Services Center Data Request

#### E. Other Center Information

If additional space is required in responding to this section, please make copies of this page

**1. Current Contract and Funding Information for states/entities served by this center**

State/Entity: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contract Dates From: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_  
Per TRS Minute Contract Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed/conversation: \_\_\_\_\_ Total/session: \_\_\_\_\_  
Per IP Minute Contract Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed/conversation: \_\_\_\_\_ Total/session: \_\_\_\_\_  
Per STS Minute Contract Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed/conversation: \_\_\_\_\_ Total/session: \_\_\_\_\_  
Per VRS Minute Contract Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed/conversation: \_\_\_\_\_ Total/session: \_\_\_\_\_  
Are there any costs for interstate TRS or STS minutes, or all IP or VRS minutes currently being recovered by a means other than the TRS Fund? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, please indicate other source of recovery: \_\_\_\_\_

**2. Current Contract and Funding Information for states/entities served by this center**

State/Entity: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contract Dates From: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_  
Per TRS Minute Contract Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed/conversation: \_\_\_\_\_ Total/session: \_\_\_\_\_  
Per IP Minute Contract Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed/conversation: \_\_\_\_\_ Total/session: \_\_\_\_\_  
Per STS Minute Contract Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed/conversation: \_\_\_\_\_ Total/session: \_\_\_\_\_  
Per VRS Minute Contract Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed/conversation: \_\_\_\_\_ Total/session: \_\_\_\_\_  
Are there any costs for interstate TRS or STS minutes, or all IP or VRS minutes currently being recovered by a means other than the TRS Fund? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, please indicate other source of recovery: \_\_\_\_\_

**3. Current Contract and Funding Information for states/entities served by this center**

State/Entity: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contract Dates From: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_  
Per TRS Minute Contract Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed/conversation: \_\_\_\_\_ Total/session: \_\_\_\_\_  
Per IP Minute Contract Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed/conversation: \_\_\_\_\_ Total/session: \_\_\_\_\_  
Per STS Minute Contract Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed/conversation: \_\_\_\_\_ Total/session: \_\_\_\_\_  
Per VRS Minute Contract Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed/conversation: \_\_\_\_\_ Total/session: \_\_\_\_\_  
Are there any costs for interstate TRS or STS minutes, or all IP or VRS minutes currently being recovered by a means other than the TRS Fund? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, please indicate other source of recovery: \_\_\_\_\_

**4. Current Contract and Funding Information for states/entities served by this center**

State/Entity: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contract Dates From: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_  
Per TRS Minute Contract Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed/conversation: \_\_\_\_\_ Total/session: \_\_\_\_\_  
Per IP Minute Contract Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed/conversation: \_\_\_\_\_ Total/session: \_\_\_\_\_  
Per STS Minute Contract Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed/conversation: \_\_\_\_\_ Total/session: \_\_\_\_\_  
Per VRS Minute Contract Rate: \_\_\_\_\_ Completed/conversation: \_\_\_\_\_ Total/session: \_\_\_\_\_  
Are there any costs for interstate TRS or STS minutes, or all IP or VRS minutes currently being recovered by a means other than the TRS Fund? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, please indicate other source of recovery: \_\_\_\_\_

## Relay Services Center Data Request

II. Total Traditional TRS Expense Data	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
<b>A. Annual Recurring Fixed/Semi-Variable Expenses</b>				
1 Rent				
2 Utilities				
3 Building Maintenance				
4 Property Tax				
5 Furniture (if leased)				
6 Office Equipment (if leased)				
7 Other				
<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>B. Annual Recurring Variable Expenses</b>				
1 Salaries & Benefits				
2 Telecommunications Expenses				
3 Offices Expenses				
4 Staff Management Expenses				
5 Billing Expenses				
6 Relay Center Management				
<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>C. Annual Administrative Expenses</b>				
1 Finance/Accounting				
2 Legal/Regulatory				
3 Engineering				
4 Operations Support				
5 Human Resources				
6 Billing				
7 Contract Management				
8 Risk Management				
9 Other Corporate Overhead				
<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>D. Annual Depreciation Associated with Capital Investment</b>				
1. Furniture & Fixtures				
2. Telecommunications Expenses				
3 Leasehold				
4. Other Capitalized				
<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>E. Other TRS Expenses</b>				
1. Taxes				
2. Other				
3 Outreach Expenses				
<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>F. Interstate Only Expenses</b>				
1. Administrative				
2. Outreach/Advertising				
3. Other expense				
4. Other expense				
<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Traditional TRS Expenses</b>	0	0	0	0

## Relay Services Center Data Request

III. Total Speech to Speech Expense Data		2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
<b>A. Annual Recurring Fixed/Semi-Variable Expenses</b>					
1. Rent					
2. Utilities					
3. Building Maintenance					
4. Property Tax					
5. Furniture (if leased)					
6. Office Equipment (if leased)					
7. Other					
	<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>B. Annual Recurring Variable Expenses</b>					
1. Salaries & Benefits					
2. Telecommunications Expenses					
3. Offices Expenses					
4. Staff Management Expenses					
5. Billing Expenses					
6. Relay Center Management					
	<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>C. Annual Administrative Expenses</b>					
1. Finance/Accounting					
2. Legal/Regulatory					
3. Engineering					
4. Operations Support					
5. Human Resources					
6. Billing					
7. Contract Management					
8. Risk Management					
9. Other Corporate Overhead					
	<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>D. Annual Depreciation Associated with Capital Investment</b>					
1. Furniture & Fixtures					
2. Telecommunications Expenses					
3. Leasehold					
4. Other Capitalized					
	<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>E. Other TRS Expenses</b>					
1. Taxes					
2. Other					
3. Outreach Expenses					
	<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>F. Interstate Only Expenses</b>					
1. Administrative					
2. Outreach/Advertising					
3. Other expense					
4. Other expense					
	<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Total STS Expenses</b>		0	0	0	0

# Relay Services Center Data Request

IV Total Video Relay Service Expense Data		2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
Non-Internet Access    Internet Access					
<b>A. Annual Recurring Fixed/Semi-Variable Expenses</b>					
1. Rent					
2. Utilities					
3. Building Maintenance					
4. Property Tax					
5. Furniture (if leased)					
6. Office Equipment (if leased)					
7. Other					
<b>Subtotal</b>		0	0	0	0
<b>B. Annual Recurring Variable Expenses</b>					
1. Salaries & Benefits					
2. Telecommunications Expenses					
3. Offices Expenses					
4. Staff Management Expenses					
5. Billing Expenses					
6. Relay Center Management					
<b>Subtotal</b>		0	0	0	0
<b>C. Annual Administrative Expenses</b>					
1. Finance/Accounting					
2. Legal/Regulatory					
3. Engineering					
4. Operations Support					
5. Human Resources					
6. Billing					
7. Contract Management					
8. Risk Management					
9. Other Corporate Overhead					
<b>Subtotal</b>		0	0	0	0
<b>D. Annual Depreciation Associated with Capital Investment</b>					
1. Furniture & Fixtures					
2. Telecommunications Expenses					
3. Leasehold					
4. Other Capitalized					
<b>Subtotal</b>		0	0	0	0
<b>E. Other TRS Expenses</b>					
1. Taxes					
2. Other					
3. Outreach Expenses					
<b>Subtotal</b>		0	0	0	0
<b>F. Interstate Only Expenses</b>					
1. Administrative					
2. Outreach/Advertising					
3. Other expense					
4. Other expense					
<b>Subtotal</b>		0	0	0	0
<b>Total VRS Expenses</b>		0	0	0	0

## Relay Services Center Data Request

V Total Internet Protocol (IP) Relay Expense Data		2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
<b>A. Annual Recurring Fixed/Semi-Variable Expenses</b>					
1 Rent					
2 Utilities					
3 Building Maintenance					
4 Property Tax					
5 Furniture (if leased)					
6 Office Equipment (if leased)					
7 Other					
	<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>B. Annual Recurring Variable Expenses</b>					
1 Salaries & Benefits					
2 Telecommunications Expenses					
3 Offices Expenses					
4 Staff Management Expenses					
5 Billing Expenses					
6 Relay Center Management					
	<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>C. Annual Administrative Expenses</b>					
1. Finance/Accounting					
2 Legal/Regulatory					
3. Engineering					
4 Operations Support					
5 Human Resources					
6. Billing					
7. Contract Management					
8. Risk Management					
9 Other Corporate Overhead					
	<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>D. Annual Depreciation Associated with Capital Investment</b>					
1 Furniture & Fixtures					
2. Telecommunications Expenses					
3. Leasehold					
4 Other Capitalized					
	<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>E. Other TRS Expenses</b>					
1 Taxes					
2 Other					
3 Outreach Expenses					
	<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>F. Interstate Only Expenses</b>					
1. Administrative					
2. Outreach/Advertising					
3. Other expense					
4. Other expense					
	<b>Subtotal</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Total IP Relay Expenses</b>		0	0	0	0

## Relay Services Center Data Request

### VI. Annual TRS Demand Data

#### A English Minutes

##### 1. Traditional Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS) Conversation Minutes

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1. Local				
2. Intrastate MTS				
3. Interstate MTS				
4. International MTS				
5. Toll Free				
6. 900 Service				
7. General Assistance (GA)				
Total Traditional Minutes				

##### 2. Internet Protocol (IP) Conversation Minutes

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1. Local, Intra & Interstate				
2. International MTS				
3. Toll Free				
4. 900 Service				
5. General Assistance (GA)				
Total IP Minutes				

##### 3. Speech To Speech (STS) Conversation Minutes

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1. Local				
2. Intrastate MTS				
3. Interstate MTS				
4. International MTS				
5. Toll Free				
6. 900 Service				
7. General Assistance (GA)				
Total STS Minutes				

##### 4. Video Relay Service (VRS) Conversation Minutes - Non-Internet Access

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1. Local				
2. Intrastate MTS				
3. Interstate MTS				
4. International MTS				
5. Toll Free				
6. 900 Service				
7. General Assistance (GA)				
Total VRS Minutes				

##### 5. Video Relay Service (VRS) Conversation Minutes - Internet Access

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1. Local, Intra & Interstate				
2. International MTS				
3. Toll Free				
4. 900 Service				
5. General Assistance (GA)				
Total VRS Internet Minutes				



## Relay Services Center Data Request

### VI. Annual TRS Demand Data

#### B. Spanish Minutes

##### 1. Traditional Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS) Conversation Minutes

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1. Local				
2. Intrastate MTS				
3. Interstate MTS				
4. International MTS				
5. Toll Free				
6. 900 Service				
7. General Assistance (GA)				
Total Traditional Minutes				

##### 2. Internet Protocol (IP) Conversation Minutes

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1. Local, Intra & Interstate				
2. International MTS				
3. Toll Free				
4. 900 Service				
5. General Assistance (GA)				
Total IP Minutes				

##### 3. Speech To Speech (STS) Conversation Minutes

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1. Local				
2. Intrastate MTS				
3. Interstate MTS				
4. International MTS				
5. Toll Free				
6. 900 Service				
7. General Assistance (GA)				
Total STS Minutes				

##### 4. Video Relay Service (VRS) Conversation Minutes - Non-Internet Access

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1. Local				
2. Intrastate MTS				
3. Interstate MTS				
4. International MTS				
5. Toll Free				
6. 900 Service				
7. General Assistance (GA)				
Total VRS Minutes				

##### 5. Video Relay Service (VRS) Conversation Minutes - Internet Access

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1. Local, Intra & Interstate				
2. International MTS				
3. Toll Free				
4. 900 Service				
5. General Assistance (GA)				
Total VRS Internet Minutes				

Center Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Relay Services Center Data Request**

**VII. Certification**

I hereby certify that I have overall responsibility for the preparation of accounting data for

\_\_\_\_\_  
(TRS, STS, IP and/or VRS PROVIDER)

and that I am authorized to execute this certification. Based upon my personal knowledge and/or information provided to me by employees or agents responsible for the preparation of data submitted herein, I hereby certify that the data has been examined and reviewed and is true and correct, and complete.

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Providers with multiple centers may sign just one Certification and should list the centers covered by the Certification in the following space.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Relay Services Center Data Request

II.A. Total Captioned Tel. VCO Expense Data (Will not be included in 2004 - 2005 rate development.)		2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
<b>A. Annual Recurring Fixed/Semi-Variable Expenses</b>					
1. Rent					
2. Utilities					
3. Building Maintenance					
4. Property Tax					
5. Furniture (if leased)					
6. Office Equipment (if leased)					
7. Other					
<b>Subtotal</b>		0	0	0	0
<b>B. Annual Recurring Variable Expenses</b>					
1. Salaries & Benefits					
2. Telecommunications Expenses					
3. Offices Expenses					
4. Staff Management Expenses					
5. Billing Expenses					
6. Relay Center Management					
<b>Subtotal</b>		0	0	0	0
<b>C. Annual Administrative Expenses</b>					
1. Finance/Accounting					
2. Legal/Regulatory					
3. Engineering					
4. Operations Support					
5. Human Resources					
6. Billing					
7. Contract Management					
8. Risk Management					
9. Other Corporate Overhead					
<b>Subtotal</b>		0	0	0	0
<b>D. Annual Depreciation Associated with Capital Investment</b>					
1. Furniture & Fixtures					
2. Telecommunications Expenses					
3. Leasehold					
4. Other Capitalized					
<b>Subtotal</b>		0	0	0	0
<b>E. Other TRS Expenses</b>					
1. Taxes					
2. Other					
3. Outreach Expenses					
<b>Subtotal</b>		0	0	0	0
<b>F. Interstate Only Expenses</b>					
1. Administrative					
2. Outreach/Advertising					
3. Other expense					
4. Other expense					
<b>Subtotal</b>		0	0	0	0
<b>Total Captioned Telephone VCO Expense</b>		0	0	0	0

# Relay Services Center Data Request

## VI. Annual TRS Demand Data

### A English Minutes

#### 1. Traditional Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS) Conversation Minutes

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1 Local				
2. Intrastate MTS				
3 Interstate MTS				
4. International MTS				
5 Toll Free				
6 900 Service				
7 General Assistance (GA)				
Total Traditional Minutes				

#### 2. Internet Protocol (IP) Conversation Minutes

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1 Local, Intra & Interstate				
2. International MTS				
3. Toll Free				
4. 900 Service				
5. General Assistance (GA)				
Total IP Minutes				

#### 3. Speech To Speech (STS) Conversation Minutes

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1. Local				
2. Intrastate MTS				
3 Interstate MTS				
4 International MTS				
5 Toll Free				
6. 900 Service				
7. General Assistance (GA)				
Total STS Minutes				

#### 4. Video Relay Service (VRS) Conversation Minutes - Non-Internet Access

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1 Local				
2 Intrastate MTS				
3 Interstate MTS				
4 International MTS				
5. Toll Free				
6 900 Service				
7 General Assistance (GA)				
Total VRS Minutes				

#### 5. Video Relay Service (VRS) Conversation Minutes - Internet Access

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1. Local, Intra & Interstate				
2 International MTS				
3 Toll Free				
4 900 Service				
5 General Assistance (GA)				
Total VRS Internet Minutes				

#### 6 Captioned Telephone VCO Conversation Minutes

(Will not be included in 2004 - 2005 rate development.)

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1 Local				
2. Intrastate MTS				
3. Interstate MTS				
4. International MTS				
5. Toll Free				
6. 900 Service				
7 General Assistance (GA)				
Total Cap. Tel. VCO Minutes				

# Relay Services Center Data Request

## VI. Annual TRS Demand Data

### B Spanish Minutes

#### 1. Traditional Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS) Conversation Minutes

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1 Local				
2 Intrastate MTS				
3 Interstate MTS				
4 International MTS				
5 Toll Free				
6 900 Service				
7 General Assistance (GA)				
Total Traditional Minutes				

#### 2. Internet Protocol (IP) Conversation Minutes

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1 Local, Intra & Interstate				
2 International MTS				
3 Toll Free				
4 900 Service				
5 General Assistance (GA)				
Total IP Minutes				

#### 3 Speech To Speech (STS) Conversation Minutes

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1 Local				
2 Intrastate MTS				
3 Interstate MTS				
4 International MTS				
5 Toll Free				
6 900 Service				
7 General Assistance (GA)				
Total STS Minutes				

#### 4. Video Relay Service (VRS) Conversation Minutes - Non-Internet Access

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1 Local				
2 Intrastate MTS				
3 Interstate MTS				
4 International MTS				
5 Toll Free				
6 900 Service				
7 General Assistance (GA)				
Total VRS Minutes				

#### 5 Video Relay Service (VRS) Conversation Minutes - Internet Access

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1 Local, Intra & Interstate				
2 International MTS				
3 Toll Free				
4 900 Service				
5 General Assistance (GA)				
Total VRS Internet Minutes				

#### 6. Captioned Telephone VCO Conversation Minutes (Will not be included in 2004 - 2005 rate development.)

Minutes	2002 Actuals	2003 Annualized Actuals	2004 Projected	2005 Projected
1 Local				
2 Intrastate MTS				
3 Interstate MTS				
4 International MTS				
5 Toll Free				
6 900 Service				
7 General Assistance (GA)				
Total Cap Tel VCO Minutes				

## INTERSTATE TRS ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP LIST

NAME	REPRESENTING/TERM	ADDRESS	TEL. & FAX N0s.	EMAIL ID
<b>Warren Barnett, Chair</b> President, Barnett & Company	Hearing/speech disability community, 4/04-3/08	430 Chestnut Street, Ste 102 Chattanooga, TN 37402-4976	423-756-0125, X 3002 423-756-0127 fax	<a href="mailto:warren@barnettandcompany.com">warren@barnettandcompany.com</a>
<b>Jorge Bauermeister</b> Commissioner, Puerto Rico Telecommunications Regulatory Board	State regulatory 8/03 – 7/07	253 Ave Arterial Hostos Capitol Ctr North Twr, Ste 1001 San Juan, PR 00918-1453	787-754-7170 787-765-4968 fax	<a href="mailto:jlbauermeister@jtrpti.gobierno.pr">jlbauermeister@jtrpti.gobierno.pr</a>
<b>Ed Bosson</b> Relay Texas Administrator Public Utility Commission	State regulatory – relay administration 4/03 – 3/07	1701 N Congress Avenue P O Box 13326 Austin, TX 78711-3326	512-936-7000 512-936-7147 tty 512-936-7003 fax	<a href="mailto:edbosson@puc.state.tx.us">edbosson@puc.state.tx.us</a>
<b>Clayton Bowen</b> Business Manager, Virginia Dept for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing	State regulatory – relay administration 4/04-3/08	1602 Rolling Hills Drive #203 Richmond, VA 23229-5012	804-662-9704 v&tty 804-662-9718 fax	<a href="mailto:bowence@ddhh.state.va.us">bowence@ddhh.state.va.us</a>
<b>Phil Erli</b> Gen Mgr, Ringgold Telephone Co	Interstate service providers 4/02 – 3/06	7449 Nashville Street Ringgold, Georgia 30736	706-965-1253 706-965-2906	<a href="mailto:perli@catt.com">perli@catt.com</a>
<b>Lowell C. Johnson</b> Commissioner Nebraska Public Service Commission	State regulatory 4/01 – 3/05	300 The Atrium 1200 N Street Lincoln, NE 68508	402-471-3101 402-471-0233 fax	<a href="mailto:ljohnson@mail.state.ne.us">ljohnson@mail.state.ne.us</a>
<b>Paul Ludwick, Vice Chair</b> TRS Product Manager Sprint	TRS providers 4/03 – 3/07	6666 West 110 <sup>th</sup> Street Mail Stop: KSOPKG0111 Overland Park, KS 66211	913-661-8927 913-661-8950 fax	<a href="mailto:paul.ludwick@mail.sprint.com">paul.ludwick@mail.sprint.com</a>
<b>Pamela Ransom, Sect'y</b> Pres., Common Ground Solutions, Inc	TRS users 4/02 – 3/06	711 S Boulevard, Ste. 5 Oak Park, IL 60302	708-660-9417 708-660-9418 fax	<a href="mailto:ransom@cgcsolutions.com">ransom@cgcsolutions.com</a>
<b>Gail Sanchez</b> TRS Product Manager, AT&T	Interstate service providers 8/03 – 7/07	222 West Adams, Rm 12EV14 Chicago, IL 60606-5307	312-230-5033 312-230-8678 tty 312-230-8615 fax	<a href="mailto:gvsanchez@att.com">gvsanchez@att.com</a>
<b>Alfred Sonnenstrahl</b> Sonny Access Consulting	TRS users 4/03 – 3/07	10910 Brewer House Road Rockville, MD 20852-3463	800-735-2258 301-770-7555 tty&fax	<a href="mailto:sonny@pobox.com">sonny@pobox.com</a>
<b>Judith Viera</b> Consultant, Mission Consulting	Hearing/speech disability community, 4/02 – 3/06	1036 Commons Drive Sacramento, CA 95825	916-641-8009(H) 916-641-8006 (H) fax	<a href="mailto:judith.viera@attbi.com">judith.viera@attbi.com</a> (H)
<b>Dixie Ziegler</b> Director of Relay, Hamilton Relay Svc.	TRS providers 4/02-3/06	1001 Twelfth Street Aurora, NE 68818	402-694-5101 402-694-5037 fax	<a href="mailto:djwhitlow@hamilton.net">djwhitlow@hamilton.net</a>
<b>Vacant</b>	Hearing/speech disability community, /04 – /08			
<b>NECA STAFF</b> <b>John Ricker</b> Director, Universal Svc Support Prog <b>Maripat Brennan</b> Manager -Fund Administration	TRS Fund Administrator July 26, 1999 – July 25, 2003 Extended 7/03 on a month-to- month basis	80 S. Jefferson Road Whippany, NJ 07981 Room S 2063  Room S 2082	973-884-8262 fax  973-884-8085  973-884-8063	<a href="mailto:jricker@neca.org">jricker@neca.org</a>  <a href="mailto:mbrenna@neca.org">mbrenna@neca.org</a>

# Interstate TRS Advisory Council

## Meeting Minutes

April 22, 2003

### Attendance

The Interstate Telecommunications Relay Services (TRS) Fund Advisory Council met in Washington, DC, on April 22, 2003. Following is a list of the Council members and other attendees at the meeting. Gus Estrella, the Council member representing persons with speech disabilities, was unable to attend the meeting.

<b>Council Members</b>	<b>Representing</b>
Warren Barnett	Deaf and Hard of Hearing Community
Ed Bosson	State Relay Administrators
Clayton Bowen	State Relay Administrators
Phil Erli	Service Providers
Lowell Johnson	State Regulatory
Anne LaLena	Service Providers
Paul Ludwick	TRS Providers
Steve Mecham	State Regulatory
Pam Ransom	TRS Users
Al Sonnenstrahl	TRS Users
Judy Viera	Deaf and Hard of Hearing Community
Dixie Ziegler	TRS Providers
<b>NECA</b>	
Maripat Brennan	TRS Fund Administration
Ken Levy	General Counsel
John Ricker	TRS Fund Administration
<b>FCC</b>	
Tom Chandler	DRO
Pam Gregory	DRO
Greg Hlibok	DRO
Cheryl King	DRO
<b>Audience</b>	
Hadi Alsegaf	MCI Relay
Brenda Kelly Frey	Maryland Relay Administration
George Lyon	Lukas, Nace, Gutierrez & Sachs
Ron O Bray	Hands On
Dennis Och	AT&T Relay
Diane McKittrick	Communication Access Center
Julie Miron	Communication Access Center
Jerry Nelson	MCI Relay
Mark Seeger	Communication Services for the Deaf
Gary Warren	Hamilton Relay

### Convene

Warren Barnett, Council Chair, convened the meeting around 8:35 a.m. Mr. Barnett asked council members and meeting attendees to introduce themselves, and then reviewed the Council's communications rules.

### Agenda

The agenda was moved for approval by Paul Ludwick and seconded by Lowell Johnson. It was approved as presented.

*Warren Barnett, Chair*  
*Ed Bosson*  
*Clayton Bowen*  
*Luis Estrella*

*Lowell Johnson*  
*Anne LaLena*  
*Paul Ludwick, Vice-Chair*  
*Stephen Mecham*

*Pamela Ransom, Secretary*  
*Alfred Sonnenstrahl*  
*Judith Viera*  
*Dixie Ziegler*

### **October 3, 2002 Meeting Minutes**

Pam Ransom moved for approval of the minutes; Judy Viera seconded. The minutes were approved

### **Fall 2003 Meeting**

Discussion on the fall meeting location was moved to this point on the agenda from the afternoon session. The Fall Council meeting was proposed to be held in conjunction with the National Association of State Relay Administration (NASRA) meeting in Albuquerque, NM, on Thursday, September 4<sup>th</sup>. Anne LaLena moved to accept the proposal, Judy Viera seconded. The motion was approved

### **Universal Service Fund Contribution Base Proceeding**

This agenda item was also moved to the morning from the afternoon session. John Ricker reported on the importance of this proceeding to the TRS Fund. NECA filed comments in the proceeding noting that TRS billing is an annual process and that companies with a contribution requirement of \$1,200 or more have the option of paying monthly. Universal Service Fund billing is a monthly process. NECA's comments suggested that, regardless of what the FCC chooses as a contribution base, TRS should still bill on an annual basis because it is much more cost effective.

### **FCC Update**

Tom Chandler began his update noting that he could not talk about all of the interesting TRS issues because they are currently pending at the FCC. The Disability Rights Office (DRO) has eight attorneys and five staff people. TRS is the largest single piece of work the DRO handles. TRS is challenging right now because as technology evolves, new situations arise that don't fit the original statutory and regulatory schemes. IP and VRS are examples of this.

When TRS regulations were first enacted, the responsibility for providing TRS was placed on the common carriers. And, at the time, all calls were carried on telephone lines and it was easy to determine intrastate and interstate calls. Research on the original House report makes clear, however, that states should have primary jurisdiction over regulating the provision of TRS, and the FCC residual authority. Although carriers have the responsibility, FCC regulations require state programs to certify rather than TRS providers.

The notion of "competition" in TRS is an interesting one. For providers, it's competing for business, but for consumers, it's choice and better options, better service, etc. In various FCC TRS orders, multivendoring in state programs is mentioned and encouraged because of the benefits that could accrue to consumers.

Cost recovery was quite clear – states pay for intrastate calls, interstate fund pays for interstate minutes – until VRS and IP came along. The FCC decided that the interstate TRS Fund should pay for all VRS minutes because of the desire to spur the use of new technology. IP minutes are all reimbursed from the fund because it is not possible to determine where the call is placed from. Wireless calls also cause a problem for the same reason. The Commission is currently studying cost recovery methods for all of these situations.

Another issue the FCC is grappling with is the non-telephone companies that want to provide just VRS. If you look at the ADA as an antidiscrimination statute requiring telephone companies to serve persons with disabilities just as they serve people without disabilities, it's hard to know what to do with companies that just want to offer VRS and don't fit the regulations.

Abuse of IP relay is also being addressed by the Commission. How to balance the abuse with first amendment rights comes into play here.

Mr. Chandler ended saying that the DRO staff is committed to doing the best they can so providers know what is expected of them and the states and, more importantly, that consumers get an efficient, user-friendly service that keeps up with technical developments.

In response to a question about when the next TRS order would be released, Mr. Chandler said the first half of 2003.

Al Sonnenstrahl commented on two things: that clear definitions of competition and consumer for TRS need to be developed, and that the entire Deaf community should not be prohibited from making international calls on IP.

---

*Warren Barnett, Chair  
Ed Bosson  
Clayton Bowen  
Luis Estrella*

---

*Lowell Johnson  
Anne LaLena  
Paul Ludwick, Vice-Chair  
Stephen Mecham*

---

*Pamela Ransom, Secretary  
Alfred Sonnenstrahl  
Judith Viera  
Dixie Ziegler*



because a few people were abusing the system Mr Chandler answered that he hoped the prohibition on international calls would be short term, and that the Commission may not have a context in which to address competition issues because it doesn't directly come up. That said, Mr Chandler will take back the idea that more care needs to be taken in the use of certain words

Cheryl King spoke next, on the rulemaking the DRO was currently working on Ms. King was confident that the next Order addressing improved TRS technology would be released 2Q03. In the March 2000 Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM) in TRS, the FCC requested comments on increasing the types of calls through TRS facilities, emergency call handling, a separate Speech-to-Speech telephone number and several other items Ms King appreciated the comments and reply comments received in this FNPRM, noting how important it is to get feedback from the public in these proceedings

Ms King noted that the IP Reconsideration Order was released in March 2003 and was recently published in the Federal Register Comments may now be filed. Waivers associated with IP Relay are all set to expire on January 1, 2008 for administrative efficiency.

Ms Viera asked if any IP providers were handling HCO calls. Ms King noted there had been no complaints regarding that Mr Barnett asked if there was a certification procedure for providers Ms. King responded that the FCC rules provide for state certification

Pam Gregory then spoke on the state program recertification. Ms. Gregory complimented another DRO member, Erica Meyers, who was leading the certification effort During the first review, a group of people went over the state applications with a fine toothed-comb A second review was performed, with each application being reviewed by a different person than who had reviewed the applications the first go-round. Ms. Gregory performed the third review of all the applications and felt things were in good shape The FCC would soon be sending out requests for additional information

One group of states demonstrated that they met the rules and deserved certification. With the second group, there were some issues, like carrier of choice, a contact name for complaints, or notification of a substantive change. The third group needed more help, they didn't address certain things in their applications

Ms Brennan noted that states might not report substantive changes because the state is not paying for the service, like IP Relay or VRS. Ms. Gregory agreed that was sometimes the case but believed the states provided the best oversight and control of services they paid for and oversight of IP and VRS was difficult.

Ed Bosson talked about carrier of choice in Texas. While carriers may cooperate, they might not want to work with the TRS provider Mr Bosson asked if the states should be given more authority for carrier of choice Ms Gregory responded that was still an issue.

Al Sonnenstrahl noted that Pam Ransom and Karen Peltz-Strauss were the only two people who reviewed the state certification applications in 1993 and complimented the FCC on the number of staff now available for the project

Judy Viera noted that the person listed for California complaints was unknown to the community. Ms. Gregory recounted some of her experiences calling all the state contact people and what she has done to resolve the problems she found

Paul Ludwick raised the issue of new VRS providers contracting with a state so that they are covered by the state certification and able to be reimbursed from the interstate fund but the state is not overseeing the service since it is not fiscally responsible FCC staff agreed this was an issue that was being addressed but there was no final resolution in sight Mr Ludwick said that the states think that by signing the contract, they're increasing competition but they don't understand there's a responsibility that goes with it. Mr. Ludwick asked if the FCC was going to advise the states of that responsibility Ms. King noted the need for these types of issues to be raised to the Commission as part of a rule making procedure so they can be analyzed and responded to.

Mr Barnett then called for a 20-minute break

---

*Warren Barnett, Chair*  
*Ed Bosson*  
*Clayton Bowen*  
*Luis Estrella*

*Lowell Johnson*  
*Anne LaLena*  
*Paul Ludwick, Vice-Chair*  
*Stephen Mechem*

*Pamela Ransom, Secretary*  
*Alfred Sonnenstrahl*  
*Judith Viera*  
*Dixie Ziegler*

Mr Barnett reconvened the meeting.

Ms. Viera asked about the status of CapTel Mr. Chandler noted that the decision is in the works, through probably not the first half of the year Ms Viera asked if it was too late to file comments Mr Chandler thought the period was closed but the comments could be filed anyway

Mr. Sonnenstrahl asked the FCC to get NARUC more involved with relay services. Ms Gregory said that could be sensitive because the NARUC is a state group that doesn't want the FCC setting their agenda Mr. Sonnenstrahl also asked if VRS funding was going to expire on December 31. Mr Chandler responded it was not going to end on that date Steve Mecham, a NARUC member, suggested the Council could work through Lowell Johnson or himself as liaison to NARUC.

### **NECA Staff Reports**

Maripat Brennan announced the new NECA website and provided instructions on how to access the TRS information that was newly available there

Ms Brennan then reported on the status of the fund as of March 30, 2003, reviewing the contributions to and payments disbursed from the fund shown on the report distributed to the Council TRS minutes continued to decrease but IP Relay minutes were growing in leaps and bounds, much higher growth than anticipated by the providers in 2002. VRS was also growing significantly

After a discussion on a table on the status report that showed the month's payments, it was decided to identify a particular row as the number of providers paid and not just the number of providers. There was additional discussion on the table – about the number of providers being paid for certain types of services. Not all providers are paid for all services – some providers do not offer all types of relay service.

Ms Brennan noted that, although the funding period runs from July through June, the July – June minutes are reimbursed from September – August because of the lag time between handling the minutes, reporting them and paying for them Although on the March 30<sup>th</sup> report, there was a balance of \$22 million projected for the end of June, there was still a responsibility to pay for May and June minutes If the fund were to cease existence as of June 30, 2003, after paying for May and June minutes, there would be a balance of about \$2 million.

Ms Brennan then reviewed an update to the March 30<sup>th</sup> report that included April payments New IP providers are entering the market The June fund balance projection was around \$14 million. If the fund were to cease existence as of June 30, 2003, May minutes would be paid but there would not be enough money left in the fund for June's reimbursement However, since the fund will continue, this is not an issue

Mr Ludwick asked if NECA wanted the Council to do something about the under-funding Ms Brennan replied that with the addition of the 10% safety margin and a positive approach to growth and minutes for the 2003 – 2004 funding period NECA believes the fund is covered for the last two months of 2002 - 2003. Ms. Brennan noted that, while in the past there was a balance left from the previous funding period used to reduce the fund requirement, there would not be a positive balance this year.

Ms Brennan then began a review of the draft May 2003 fund size, reimbursement rates and contribution factor filing, starting with a history of these items from the start of the fund in 1993. She cautioned that this was the proposed filing and nothing was final until the FCC's order was released Using Exhibit 4, Ms. Brennan reviewed the development of the projected rates, minutes and \$115.4 million fund size.

Ms Brennan described the difficulty in developing a toll-free and 900 minute allocation factor because of the decrease in traditional TRS minutes where intrastate and interstate can be identified, and the increase in IP minutes where the jurisdiction is unknown. The 2003 filing proposes to freeze the factor at 51% allocated to the interstate fund, the same factor as 2002 – 2003

Ms Brennan also noted differences in forecasting between traditional TRS and STS and IP and VRS. Traditional TRS and STS are tied to state contracts – forecasting is more accurate because of the historical data available for the

---

*Warren Barnett, Chair*  
*Ed Bosson*  
*Clayton Bowen*  
*Luis Estrella*

---

*Lowell Johnson*  
*Anne LaLena*  
*Paul Ludwick, Vice-Chair*  
*Stephen Mecham*

---

*Pamela Ransom, Secretary*  
*Alfred Sonnenstrahl*  
*Judith Viera*  
*Dixie Ziegler*

states IP and VRS are offered nationally on a minute by minute competitive basis. Provider forecasts overlap to a certain extent so it's necessary to balance historical data with the provider forecasts.

Because the time was approaching the lunch hour, Ms Brennan concluded her morning remarks with a report that there was no news in the Publix Relay fraud case. The Council then broke for lunch.

Mr Barnett reconvened the meeting after lunch. Ms Brennan continued her presentation explaining how the interstate traditional TRS and all IP relay minute rate was developed. International IP minutes were not included in the calculation because of the FCC's decision not to reimburse for them. Mr. Ludwick commented that even if the international minutes were removed from the calculation, the fixed costs for those minutes should be included because they will still exist. Only the variable costs should be removed.

STS is being provided from 20 centers by five providers. The proposed rate is \$2,445, down from the current \$4

For VRS, Ms. Brennan noted that there is concern at the FCC about the current \$17 per minute reimbursement rate. NECA collects and analyzes the provider data, and questions the providers about the data when necessary, but normally accepts what the providers submit because the projections are from their business plans for the period. However, in analyzing the data, we noted that profit margins ranged as high as 20%. To level the playing field and try to control VRS costs, NECA made a decision that 10% might be a legitimate profit margin to add on top of the costs. The proposed rate reflected that 10% margin for each company. The costs provided for VRS for this period were a mix of provider and/or subcontractor costs. The rate developed using this methodology was around \$12 per minute.

A long discussion on VRS followed. Mr. Ludwick noted that no one could tell us when funding for VRS will stop and that makes it impossible for you to spread your investment out. This makes it a risky situation and people who get involved in risky situations are entitled to more profit. Mr. Barnett asked Mr. Ludwick if the FCC gave an order, would the rates go down. Mr. Ludwick answered that if you could capitalize the investment over ten years, the cost would go down. Mr. Bosson believes that the cost of interpreters is beginning to climb because of the competition with VRS.

Ms. Ransom asked about profit margins for the other relay services. Ms. Brennan responded that providers are able to include the profit margins in Section E of the center data request form but there is no specific amount that may be reported.

Mr. Barnett noted that VRS has high equipment and labor costs and low efficiency. Mr. Ludwick returned to his issue that the 10% margin on Sprint's and its subcontractor's costs meant they were splitting the 10% profit, and that calculating the VRS rate the way NECA did was different from how the other services' rates were calculated. Ms. Brennan responded to a question about using the traditional methodology to develop the VRS rate – the rate would be around \$15 per minute. Mr. Ludwick feels that the same methodology needs to be used or, if there is a need to specify an acceptable profit margin, the companies should be notified.

Ms. LaLena commented that setting a particular profit figure was not a decision that should come before the Council. She believed in consistent calculations for all services. After more discussion, Mr. Ludwick moved that we calculate the rates for video relay services for the years 2003 and 2004 based on the cost data submitted by the providers in the same manner as the rate is determined for the other products that we set reimbursement rates for. Mr. Bosson seconded. The motion carried.

Ms. Brennan noted that the increase in the VRS rate would increase the fund size to \$121 million.

Mr. Ludwick returned to the issue of fixed and variable costs with IP Relay minutes. Because the number of international minutes was relatively small and there was not enough time to determine the variable costs for the international minutes before the filing, the decision was made to leave all the costs in when the minutes were removed.

---

*Warren Barnett, Chair*  
*Ed Bosson*  
*Clayton Bowen*  
*Luis Estrella*

---

*Lowell Johnson*  
*Anne LaLena*  
*Paul Ludwick, Vice-Chair*  
*Stephen Meckam*

---

*Pamela Ransom, Secretary*  
*Alfred Sonnenstrahl*  
*Judith Viera*  
*Dixie Ziegler*

Ms. Brennan then explained how the TRS and IP minute growth rates were developed. Based on historical trends, TRS is declining Using history since mid-2002 and providers' projections, IP minutes will grow significantly for 2003 – 2004.

Mr Barnett excused himself to catch a flight. Mr Ludwick took over as chair for the rest of the meeting.

For STS, there is slow growth The same growth rate used for 2002 - 2003 was used for 2003 – 2004 VRS has grown steadily during 2002. For the 2003 – 2004 forecast, actual data and the providers' projections were combined to develop the projection.

Ms Viera made a motion to accept the NECA filing with the changes with the approximate factor of .00164 Ms LaLena seconded The motion was approved

Mr Ricker mentioned that, before the FCC left, they asked NECA to meet with them shortly after the filing and then again after they have had a chance to digest it NECA will do that The filing will go through a regular comments cycle.

### **New/Old Business**

Pam Ransom noted that, based on the FCC report, this would be a good time, as individuals, to comment on the need for outreach Ms Viera said that California consumers are very concerned about the lack of outreach and that she felt the STS volumes were dismal. Ms Viera thought it was necessary to keep outreach on the front burner at the FCC

Ed Bosson said that he has explained to his Texas email alert group how to file a complaint with the FCC. He has heard from several of these people that they get no response after submitting their complaints Ed wanted the FCC to be aware of this and requested they at least acknowledge receiving the complaint.

Al Sonnenstrahl thinks outreach could help solve a problem that he's having. When required to enter a telephone number, whether on the Internet or via telephone or TTY, there is only enough room for a regular telephone number If he enters his TTY number, he will not be able to answer if he's called directly by a hearing person, but there is not enough space to include 7-1-1 and the number It would be helpful to have an indicator that the telephone number is a TTY number and then the caller would call via relay Mr Sonnenstrahl thinks outreach could help resolve this.

Paul Ludwick asked Ms. Brennan what the FCC was doing with the wireless petition (submitted July 2002). No current information was available.

Mr Ludwick asked for comments from the audience. Julie Miron thanked Ms Brennan for her help with the recent audit.

George Lyon believes that the VRS growth rate may be too low, judging by the monthly increases and new providers coming in Ms Brennan responded that we took both historical growth, the new providers, and the providers' projections into account. There could be additional growth and the 10 percent safety margin should cover it Mr. Lyon is concerned that the growth will be substantially higher and the company he represents hasn't begun marketing yet Ms Brennan advised that comments regarding the growth rate could be filed with the FCC once the comments cycle begins

Julie Miron asked if there was substantial growth, could the rate be adjusted. Ms. Brennan said that rates had changed within the funding period before

Ken Levy mentioned a conversation with Tom Chandler and Cheryl King about the tenth anniversary of interstate TRS and the fund, and the possibility of a celebration. NECA will keep the Council informed.

Ms. Brennan noted that NECA's term as TRS Fund Administrator was due to expire on July 25, 2003. The FCC is expected to issue a Request for Proposal in late 3Q03 or 4Q03

---

*Warren Barnett, Chair*  
*Ed Bosson*  
*Clayton Bowen*  
*Luis Estrella*

---

*Lowell Johnson*  
*Anne LaLena*  
*Paul Ludwick, Vice-Chair*  
*Stephen Mecham*

---

*Pamela Ransom, Secretary*  
*Alfred Sonnenstrahl*  
*Judith Viera*  
*Dixie Ziegler*

Mr. Ludwick thanked Steve Mecham, who was leaving the Council, for his active participation.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 3 00 PM

Respectfully submitted,  
Pam Ransom  
Secretary

By Maripat Brennan, NECA

Approved by Council at their September 4, 2003 meeting

---

*Warren Barnett, Chair*  
*Ed Bosson*  
*Clayton Bowen*  
*Luis Estrella*

*Lowell Johnson*  
*Anne LaLena*  
*Paul Ludwick, Vice-Chair*  
*Stephen Mecham*

*Pamela Ransom, Secretary*  
*Alfred Sonnenstrahl*  
*Judith Viera*  
*Dixie Ziegler*

# Interstate TRS Advisory Council

## Meeting Minutes September 4, 2003

ATTENDEES	REPRESENTING
<b>Council Members</b>	
Jorge Bauermeister	State Regulatory
Ed Bosson	State Relay Administrators
Clayton Bowen	State Relay Administrators
Phil Erli	Service Providers
Lowell Johnson	State Regulatory
Paul Ludwick	TRS Providers
Pam Ransom	TRS Users
Gail Sanchez	Service Providers
Al Sonnenstrahl	TRS Users
Judy Viera	Deaf and Hard of Hearing Community
Dixie Ziegler	TRS Providers
<b>NECA</b>	
Maripat Brennan	TRS Fund Administration
Ken Levy	General Counsel
John Ricker	TRS Fund Administration
<b>FCC</b>	
Cheryl King	CGB - DRO
<b>Audience</b>	
Gunny Barr	IN Relay Services
Marilyn Benoit	MA Relay Administration
Shelley Bergum	CA Disability and Telecom Program
Beth Blackmer	OH Relay Administration
Kristylynn Brady	UT TRS Specialist
Todd Butterworth	NV Relay Administration
Michael Byington	KS Relay Administration
Jack Cassell	WI Relay Administration
Patty Kress	IL TRS Administration
Kyrss Kuntz	MT Relay Administration
Diane Devaney	Devaney and Associates
James Forstall	FL Relay Inc
Brenda Kelly Frey	Maryland Relay Administration
John Hooper	Ass't Dir., NM Commission for the Deaf and HOH
Grace House	PA TRS Administration
Richard Kerby	KS Relay
Ed Kinal	AZ Relay Administration
Robert Lanter	WY Relay Administration
Ron O Bray	Hands On
Julie Orchard	UT TRS Administration
Paula McClure	IL TRS Administration
Diana McKittrick	Communication Access Center
Steve Miedziak	WY Vocational Rehabilitation
Julie Miron	Communication Access Center
Jerry Nelson	MCI Relay
Linda Nelson	NC Relay Administration
Mark Seeger	Communication Services for the Deaf
Jim Skjeveland	Communication Services for the Deaf
Jim Stevens	KY TRS Administration
Pam Stewart	Maryland Relay Administration
Steve Stovall	NE Relay Administration

Warren Barnett, Chair  
 Jorge Bauermeister  
 Ed Bosson  
 Clayton Bowen

Luis Estrella  
 Lowell Johnson  
 Paul Ludwick, Vice-Chair  
 Pamela Ransom, Secretary

Gail Sanchez  
 Alfred Sonnenstrahl  
 Judith Viera  
 Dixie Ziegler

Gary Warren	Hamilton Relay
David Weiss	CA Disability and Telecom Program
Susan Weis	Devaney and Associates
Lori Cielinski	WY Relay Administration

#### **Attendance**

The Interstate Telecommunications Relay Services (TRS) Fund Advisory Council met in Albuquerque, NM, on September 4, 2003. Council members and other attendees at the meeting are listed above. Warren Barnett, Council Chair, and Gus Estrella, Council member, were unable to attend the meeting. Because the Council meeting was held the day before the National Association of State Relay Administrators (NASRA) annual meeting, guest attendance was significantly higher than usual.

#### **Convene**

Paul Ludwick, Council Chair, convened the meeting around 8:30 a.m. Mr. Ludwick asked council members and other attendees to introduce themselves, and then he reviewed the Council's communications rules.

#### **Agenda**

The agenda was moved for approval by Al Sonnenstrahl and seconded by Lowell Johnson. It was approved as presented.

#### **April 22, 2003 Meeting Minutes**

Judy Viera offered two changes to the minutes. Ed Bosson moved to accept the minutes as amended; Ms. Viera seconded. The minutes were approved.

#### **Officer Elections**

Because Mr. Barnett, the current chair, was not able to attend the meeting, Mr. Sonnenstrahl moved to postpone the election until the April 2004 meeting. Mr. Johnson seconded; the motion was approved.

#### **FCC Update**

Cheryl King thanked the Council and NASRA for holding the meetings back to back, saving time and expenses. Ms. King's presentation to the Council would focus on cost recovery. The NASRA presentation will address standards and policy.

Ms. King noted the following accomplishments during the prior year:

- Release of the Coin Sent-Paid reconsideration order
- IP Relay reconsideration order released
- June 17, 2003 order and reconsideration order on various items plus an NPRM on other items released
- June 30, 2003 interim rate order released
- Captioned telephone VCO declaratory ruling released
- State certifications completed

Open proceedings at the FCC on relay service include VRS cost recovery, IP relay reconsideration requests, and wireless cost recovery. Resolution of these items should occur in about twelve months, if not sooner.

Emergency preparedness is particularly important now. Comments are sought in the NPRM to build a record on this topic. Comments are also being sought on a certification process for relay service providers, to determine who should receive reimbursement from the TRS Fund.

John Ricker mentioned that the Interstate TRS Fund celebrated its tenth birthday mid-2003 and asked when the competitive bid for the next administration term would be released. Ms. King responded that the Commission was proud of the tenth anniversary of nationwide availability of relay service and that the procurement was on the DRO's twelve-month calendar.

Pam Stewart asked how many comments and what kinds of comments are received in order to make a decision. Ms. King responded that the FCC wants to receive comments from disability advocacy groups, relay service providers, state administrators, and the common carriers. It is not just the quantity of comments received but also the depth of the information on the issue that is important.

---

*Warren Barnett, Chair  
Jorge Bauermeister  
Ed Bosson  
Clayton Bowen*

---

*Luis Estrella  
Lowell Johnson  
Paul Ludwick, Vice-Chair  
Pamela Ransom, Secretary*

---

*Gail Sanchez  
Alfred Sonnenstrahl  
Judith Viera  
Dixie Ziegler*

Ms. Viera expressed the consumers' interest in budgeting for a national outreach program. Ms. King noted that the FCC is still concerned about the legality of the FCC directing a national outreach campaign funded by carriers. A lengthy discussion followed on the subject. Ms. King advised the audience to submit comments on the issue in response to the NPRM in order to create a public record.

Ms. King was asked how the situation with the 2003-2004 VRS rate could be prevented in the future – the proposed rate was not the rate that was approved in the June 30, 2003 FCC fund order. She responded that the proposed rates will be reviewed in more detail before submission to the FCC.

Brenda Kelly Frey asked a question about standards included in the June 17, 2003 order. Mr. Ludwick asked for that question to be addressed at the NASRA meeting rather than the Council meeting.

Additional discussion occurred on outreach. Mr. Ludwick closed this portion of the meeting with a request for comments on the topic so that they may be placed on the public record. Mr. Ludwick then announced a 15-minute break.

Mr. Ludwick brought the meeting back to order, to discuss the FCC decision on the VRS rate – the topic Mr. Sonnenstrahl had requested be placed on the agenda.

Mr. Sonnenstrahl raised the issue of how to ensure that there are no surprises concerning the reimbursement rates when the funding order is released in June. Mr. Ricker responded that NECA has taken proactive steps with the FCC to ensure this doesn't happen again. NECA will collect more specific cost data and will require justification for what the providers are doing and why. NECA will spend more time scrubbing the data received prior to submitting it to the FCC. NECA will do all it can to avoid a recurrence of what happened in June 2003.

In response to a question from Mr. Bosson about NECA's analysis of the data, Mr. Ricker noted that, since traditional TRS costs were related to a competitive bid contract on the state side, NECA knew that the costs that were being submitted had a relationship to the bid price. With VRS, there are no state contracts. The FCC has asked NECA to dig deeply into the providers' costs so that the FCC has more confidence in the expenses. Mr. Bosson expressed the concern of state administrators that they want the VRS costs to be reasonable, especially if the states have to pick up the VRS tab in the future.

#### **Public Comments**

Mr. Ludwick opened the floor to comments at this point since some NASRA members were not going to be able to rejoin the meeting after lunch.

Ms. Stewart asked if there was oversight of VRS prior to the reimbursement of vendors. Mr. Ludwick replied that oversight was not the Council's responsibility. Ms. King noted that NECA has procedures for reimbursement and the FCC is working with the administrator to have more intense oversight of that reimbursement.

In response to a question from Ms. Viera on provider audits, Mr. Ricker explained that each provider is audited every three years. This year, additional audit work on VRS was performed. Gail Sanchez asked Mr. Ricker to clarify NECA's and the Council's role regarding service quality. Mr. Ricker responded that the administrator proposes compensation levels for the providers, collects the carriers' contributions, pays the providers, and analyzes the provider data for accuracy. The Council assures that the administrator is doing their job. Mr. Ludwick added that the Council addresses financial issues associated with relay service.

Ron Obray, Hands On VRS, asked who ultimately has the responsibility to determine what functional equivalency to dial tone means to the deaf consumer. Mr. Obray is concerned with not being able to improve his VRS service at a reimbursement rate of \$7.75 and not being able to provide true functional equivalency. Julie Miron agreed with Mr. Obray. Ms. Miron went on to ask if the FCC is considering a three-month interim to give providers time to adjust to the \$7.75. Ms. King said she would get back to Ms. Miron on that.

#### **Spring 2004 Meeting**

Mr. Johnson moved that the spring meeting be held in Washington, DC, at the same hotel where it's been held the past few years. Mr. Erli seconded. The motion was approved. The meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 20, 2004.

---

*Warren Barnett, Chair  
Jorge Bauermeister  
Ed Bosson  
Clayton Bowen*

---

*Luis Estrella  
Lowell Johnson  
Paul Ludwick, Vice-Chair  
Pamela Ransom, Secretary*

---

*Gail Sanchez  
Alfred Sonnenstrahl  
Judith Viera  
Dixie Ziegler*



## **NECA Staff Reports**

Maripat Brennan first reviewed the package of handouts with the Council and the audience, including an overview of the fund, the Council member list, the agreement extending NECA as the administrator on a month-to-month basis, the fund status reports, the annual data collection forms, and an update on changes to the collection procedures. She also reminded the attendees to check out the TRS pages on the NECA website.

Ms. Brennan reviewed the monthly status report and spreadsheet, explained the different entries and noted a fund balance of \$18.7 million. She explained how the filing is submitted in May, the FCC order is released in June, and the carriers are billed in July. Ms. Brennan noted the movement of minutes from traditional TRS to IP, and the growth of IP and VRS. Eight TRS providers, five STS providers, four IP providers and five VRS providers – a total of ten providers – are reimbursed from the fund.

Ms. Brennan then moved on to the additional information that would be required with the annual data collection and the change in the deadline for the submission of the data. More data on salaries and benefits, occupancy and utilization rates, tax structure, outreach, and profit margin will be required. The request for data will be distributed by October 1<sup>st</sup> instead of December 1<sup>st</sup> and will be due January 1<sup>st</sup> instead of February 1<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Ricker requested that detail on engineering expense also be included.

Ms. Viera expressed her concern that VRS providers might be including equipment costs in their submission or that they might be requiring a minimum number of minutes each month. Ms. Brennan responded that the cost of equipment given to consumers is not to be included in the provider costs. Regarding the requirement to use so many minutes a month, it's the consumer's decision on whether or not to take the equipment. Several minutes of discussion continued on this point. Mr. Ludwick's concern was with keeping track of customer usage – who's called at what number. Jorge Bauermeister believes the FCC has been clear in establishing its concern about the use of consumer data.

Ms. Brennan concluded with a review of the new collection process required by the FCC, since the TRS Fund is part of the FCC financial statements. Delinquent carriers' debts will be transferred to the FCC when the debt is 90 days old. If the debt is not paid, it could be transferred to the US Treasury. This change in procedures took place September 1<sup>st</sup>.

Dixie Ziegler requested that NECA look closely at the differences in costs between traditional TRS and IP to see if IP is incorrectly influencing the traditional TRS rate.

Mr. Johnson asked if there was any reason to track wireline and wireless calls separately. Mr. Ricker replied that there is not a reason to track the calls separately today but maybe in the future, when the FCC acts on a petition on wireless calls. In response to a question from Ms. Sanchez on the toll-free and 900 minutes allocation, Ms. Brennan explained that the factor remained at 51% interstate, 49% intrastate because, with the migration of minutes from traditional TRS to IP, a more accurate factor could not be developed.

## **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned around noon.

Respectfully submitted,  
Pam Ransom  
Secretary

By Maripat Brennan, NECA

Approved by TRS Council at April 20, 2004 meeting

---

*Warren Barnett, Chair*  
*Jorge Bauermeister*  
*Ed Bosson*  
*Clayton Bowen*

*Luis Estrella*  
*Lowell Johnson*  
*Paul Ludwick, Vice-Chair*  
*Pamela Ransom, Secretary*

*Gail Sanchez*  
*Alfred Sonnenstrahl*  
*Judith Viera*  
*Dixie Ziegler*